REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-17, 19 and 20 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 13 is cancelled. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendment.

This amendment should be entered after final rejection at least because it merely cancels a claim, and thus does not raise any new issues or the issue of new matter.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,720,873 to Goodman et al. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 13.

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,954,728 to Kusumoto et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kusumoto et al., alone or combined with "the law of supply and demand" does not disclose or suggest raising and advertising charge as the number of accesses increases and reducing a placing charge as the number of accesses increases. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action relies on impermissible hindsight, and Applicant respectfully disagrees with the reasoning set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. In particular, an increase in accesses to the web page does not reflect an increase in supply, but rather reflects an increase in demand for the web page. Thus, even using the Office Action's reasoning, "the law of supply and demand" would suggest that the placing charge to the web page provider should be increased because there is an increased demand in that web page.

As described in Applicant's specification at, for example, paragraph [0038], lowering the placing charge as the number of accesses increases encourages web page providers to create better web pages that drive more users to that web page. By creating a better (more popular) web page, more users will access the page, causing a lowering of the placing charge. However, because more users will view the advertising data, there will be an increase in the advertising charge. Because, as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 16, the lowering of the

placing charge for increased accesses is combined with an increase in the advertising charge that is charged to a supplier of the advertising data, increased fees still can be collected.

Neither Kusumoto et al. nor "the law of supply and demand" discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 16. Accordingly, claims 1, 9 and 16 and their dependent claims are patentable. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 4, 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kusumoto et al. in view of US 2002/0077964 to Brody et al. In addition, claims 6, 11 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kusumoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,513 to Rinebold et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed. These claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to their corresponding independent claims 1, 9 and 16. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kusumoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,210 to Goldhaber et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Kusumoto et al. and Goldhaber et al. does not disclose or suggest the features recited in independent claims 7 and 14. The Office Action acknowledges that Kusumoto et al. does not teach sending accounting data to a user computer. The Office Action, however, asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Kusumoto et al. in view of col. 19, lines 57-67 of Goldhaber et al. so as to "allow Kusumoto to make more money." The Office Action, however, overlooks the additional feature, recited in independent claims 7 and 14, that the cost indicated by the accounting data varies "according to a time period when the advertising data is transmitted to the first computer." Goldhaber merely indicates that a user can be charged for the supply of information. Goldhaber et al. does not disclose or suggest varying that charge according to a time period when the advertising data is transmitted to the first computer. As described in conjunction with Applicant's Fig. 7 and 8 (see, for example, paragraphs [0041] - [0043]), the

combination of features recited in independent claims 7 and 14 allows for the charging of a premium or a discount depending on the time when the advertising data is transmitted to the computer. For example, a premium can be charged to obtain the data well in advance of an event, whereas a discount (or possibly even the advertising data for free) can be provided close to the event date. Neither Kusumoto et al. nor Goldhaber et al. suggests the combination of features recited in claims 7 and 14.

Moreover, in view of the specific implementation described in Kusumoto et al., involving a virtual world having avatars, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the Kusumoto et al. system to charge a user for the supply of advertising data as proposed in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 is requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

JAO:MAC/ccs

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 7, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461